

REMARKS

Claims 1-127 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 30, 34, 65, 69, 100, 104, 112, 119, and 120 have been amended.

The specification was objected to because the serial numbers of the co-pending applications were missing. The specification has been amended to add these serial numbers. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The drawings were objected to because the images were unclear when scanned. Twenty-three replacement sheets have been attached to this document, containing FIGS. 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A, 3B, 4-10, 11A, 11B, 12A, 12B, 13A, 13B, 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B, and 16-19. None of the figures has been amended.

Claim 119 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner argued there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the computer program product.” Claim 119 has been amended to depend from claim 112 instead of from claim 41 and is definite. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

CLAIMS 1, 34, and 69

Claims 1, 34, and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhao. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A user interface for editing a project comprising a plurality of media clips, comprising:
a timeline display, comprising:
an overview layer comprising first editable representations of at least a subset of the media clips; and

for each media clip, a track comprising a second editable representation of the media clip, wherein the track and the overview layer are concurrently displayed; and
a movable cursor, for editing the representations of the media clips and for controlling the timeline display.

As recited in claim 1, a “timeline display” refers to an overview layer comprising first editable representations of media clips and, for each media clip, a track comprising a second editable representation of the media clip. The timeline display provides an overview of the entire video project and its temporal arrangement (§40). As described in the specification, the timeline display clearly shows, in both the overview layer and individual tracks, areas where clips overlap and are composited (§52). The two-level display scheme enables the user to see and manipulate the overall structure of the series of media clips while simultaneously, if desired, seeing and manipulating the details of the clips in their respective tracks (§52).

Zhao teaches a video editing graphical user interface with layer view (title). Zhao teaches a timeline pane (3:43-61; FIG. 3) comprising media clips and, for each media clip, a layer pane (4:11-45; FIG. 4). Zhao does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed element “a timeline display, comprising an overview layer . . . and for each media clip, a track . . . wherein the track and the overview layer are concurrently displayed.”

The Examiner argued that Zhao’s timeline pane corresponds to the claimed element “overview layer” and that Zhao’s layer pane corresponds to the claimed element “track.” Although Zhao’s timeline pane and layer pane are viewable to the user, Zhao does not teach or suggest a user interface that enables the user to view both panes concurrently. Zhao teaches that “any video clip initially added to storyboard pane 200 or timeline pane 300 contains only one layer, so on that occasion the user has to select layer tab to access layer pane 400” (4:23-26). Even when the video clip contains multiple layers, the user cannot view both the timeline pane and the layer pane concurrently (4:9-30).

Thus, Zhao does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a timeline display, comprising an overview layer . . . and for each media clip, a track . . . wherein the track and the overview layer are concurrently displayed.”

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Zhao. Claims 34 and 69 recite similar language and are therefore patentable over Zhao.

CLAIMS 30, 65, and 100

Claims 30, 65, and 100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Foreman. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, claim 30 recites:

A user interface for editing a project comprising a plurality of media clips, comprising:
a canvas, comprising a plurality of selectable and spatially movable representations of media clips; and
a timeline display representing a duration of the project, the timeline display comprising, for each currently selected representation of a media clip in the canvas, a timeline representation of the media clip;
wherein the timeline display is activated in response to at least one spatially movable representation being selected, and wherein the timeline display is deactivated in response to no spatially movable representation being selected.

As recited in claim 30, a “canvas” comprises a plurality of selectable and spatially movable representations of media clips. A “timeline display” represents the entire duration of the project. The timeline display comprises, for each selected representation of a media clip in the canvas, a “timeline representation” of the media clip. As described in the specification, the width of the timeline display represents the entire duration of the project (§84; FIG. 16). This timeline display is a miniature version of a timeline associated with a displayed video clip (§82; FIG. 16). The timeline display is automatically displayed when the user selects an object having a temporal component in the canvas (§83).

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Zhao does not disclose, teach, or suggest a timeline display, comprising, for each currently selected representation of a media clip in the canvas, a timeline representation of the media clip. It follows that Zhao also does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed element “a timeline display representing a duration of the project, the timeline display comprising, for each currently selected representation of a media clip in the canvas, a timeline representation of the media clip.”

Foreman does not remedy this deficiency. Foreman discloses a computer program product for video editing. Foreman discloses a viewer window that has an associated timeline that enables a user to preview imported clips (¶¶56 and 67). This associated timeline represents the duration of a clip, not the duration of the project (as recited in claim 30).

Thus, Foreman does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a timeline display representing a duration of the project, the timeline display comprising, for each currently selected representation of a media clip, a timeline representation of the media clip.”

Therefore, claim 30 is patentable over Zhao and Foreman, alone and in combination. Claims 65 and 100 recite similar language and are therefore patentable over Zhao and Foreman, alone and in combination.

CLAIMS 104, 112, and 120

Claims 104, 112, and 120 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Fasciano. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, claim 104 recites:

In a media editing application, a method of moving a media clip to a destination location, comprising:
receiving a user command to drag the media clip to the destination location; and
displaying, in response to receiving the user command, a drop menu comprising a plurality of commands for integrating the dragged media clip at the destination location.

As recited in claim 104, “a method of moving a media clip to a destination location” involves displaying, in response to receiving a user command to drag the clip to the destination location, a drop menu comprising a plurality of commands that enables the user to choose how to integrate the dragged media clip at the destination location. As described in the specification, the drop menu includes different commands depending where in the timeline display the user drops the clip (¶64). If the user drops the object before the menu appears, a default choice is applied (¶64).

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Zhao does not disclose, teach, or suggest displaying a drop menu comprising a plurality of commands for integrating the dragged media clip at the destination location. It follows that Zhao also does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed element “displaying, in response to receiving the user command, a drop menu comprising a plurality of commands for integrating the dragged media clip at the destination location.”

Fasciano does not remedy this deficiency. Fasciano discloses a digital sound editing application for editing within a timeline. A “place/replace” mode setting menu indicates the current placement mode (FIG. 3). Depending on the placement mode, different commands are accessible in a drop menu (button 124 in FIG. 3). When no region is selected, the placement mode is “place,” but when a region is selected, the placement mode is “replace” (6:39-49).

In Fasciano, the drop menu permits a selection from among multiple commands when a region is selected in the timeline (6:39-49). However, this menu is not displayed in response to the user command to drag the media clip to the destination location (as recited in claim 104).

Thus, Fasciano does not disclose, teach, or suggest “displaying, in response to receiving the user command, a drop menu comprising a plurality of commands for integrating the dragged media clip at the destination location.”

Therefore, claim 104 is patentable over Zhao and Fasciano, alone and in combination. Claims 112 and 120 recite similar language and are therefore patentable over Zhao and Fasciano, alone and in combination.

OTHER CLAIMS

Claims 2-8, 12-16, 25, 35-41, 45-50, 60, 70-76, 80-85, and 95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhao.

Claims 9, 42, and 77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao. Claims 10, 11, 43, 44, 78, and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Foreman. Claims 17, 21-24, 51, 56-59, 86, 91-94, 109-111, 117-119, and 125-127 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Fasciano. Claims 18-20, 105-108, 52-55, 113-116, 87-90, and 121-124 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Fasciano further in view of Foreman. Claims 26-29, 31-33, 61-64, 66-68, 96-99, and 101-103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Foreman.

Applicants respectfully traverse. In addition, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions regarding the disclosures of Foreman and Fasciano and the motivation to combine Zhao and Foreman and Zhao and Fasciano.

The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Zhao, Zhao in view of Foreman, and Zhao in view of Fasciano. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

PATENT

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
GREGORY E. NILES, ET AL.

Dated: July 17, 2007

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No.: 55,687
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7187
Fax.: (650) 938-5200